

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 12/7/2011 has been entered. Pursuant to said request claims 1, 2 and 6 have been amended. No claims have been added or cancelled. Accordingly, claims 1-6 are pending in this office action.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-6 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 2003 0217133 (hereinafter Ostrup) in view of US 20040167891 (hereinafter Galindo)

As for claim 1 Ostrup discloses: an input buffer in which an entity to be validated for consistency can be placed (See paragraph 0023), output means in which the result of the consistency validation can be stored and communication means to communicate with the different IT systems (See paragraphs 0039), wherein an adapter for each of the IT systems allows communication between the consistency service and the IT system having a respective data model, such that a signal sent by the consistency service to verify an existence of a specific data set of an IT system can be sent back to the consistency service if that specific data set exists (See paragraphs 0024, 0028 and figure 4) , and wherein a reference container holds references to the entities in the data sets of the various IT systems such that the a specific entity of a respective data model in a specific IT system can be addressed through the adapter of the specific IT system (See paragraph 0027 note the consistency check is done in terms of managed objects), said method comprising the following steps: loading a reference the entity to be

validated for consistency into the buffer of the consistency service, , storing a consistency validating information in the output means, based on the signal being sent back to the consistency service by the adapter of the IT system associated with the entity to be validated for consistency (See paragraphs 0038-0039 and 0041).

Ostrup however does not explicitly disclose modeling physical assets of a utility nor initializing an adapter of the IT system associated with the entity to be validated for consistency the consistency service sending a signal for verifying the existence of a specific data set to the IT system holding the entity to be validated for consistency

Galindo however does explicitly disclose modeling physical assets of a utility (See paragraphs 0038 and 0067) and initializing an adapter of the IT system associated with the entity to be validated for consistency the consistency service sending a signal for verifying the existence of a specific data set to the IT system holding the entity to be validated for consistency (See paragraphs 0012, 0028, and 0029) It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the pertinent at the time the invention was made to have incorporated the teaching of Galindo into the system of Ostrup. The modification would have been obvious because the two references are concerned with the solution to problem of data processing, therefore there is an implicit motivation to combine these references (i.e. motivation from the references themselves). In other words, the ordinary skilled artisan, during his/her quest for a solution to the cited problem, would look to the cited references at the time the invention was made. Consequently, the ordinary skilled artisan would have been motivated to combine the cited references since Galindo teaching would enable users of the Ostrup system to validate queries and data (See

Art Unit: 2166

Galindo abstract). Consequently, there would have been a reasonable expectation of success since the both reference are designed to process information based on rules.

As for claim 2 the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further Ostrup discloses: logging failure of consistency validation if no signal is being sent back to the consistency service, by adding the entity, which was to be validated for consistency, and the IT system, which was not replying to the signal, to a log file (See paragraph 0024 note checks handle failures).

As for claim 3 the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further Ostrup discloses: the consistency service checking the communication to the IT system holding the data set to be verified prior to sending the signal to verify the existence of the specific data set of that IT system (See paragraph 0026).

As for claim 4 the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further Ostrup discloses: loading a multitude of entities to be validated for consistency into the buffer of the consistency service, and the consistency, service successively processing the entities to be validated for consistency, sending out signals and storing consistency validating information in the output means (See paragraphs 0026-0028).

Art Unit: 2166

Claims 5 and 6 are a computer program product and system claims corresponding to the method of claim 1 and is thus rejected for the same reasons as set forth in the rejection of claim 1.

### **Information**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ELIYAH S. HARPER whose telephone number is (571)272-0759. The examiner can normally be reached on Flex.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain Alam can be reached on (571) 272-3978. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/ELIYAH S HARPER/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2166  
February 13, 2012